Dear Jim,

1/17/75

Sorry I was late going for Lil when you phoned last night to tell me what happened in your meeting with Webster. I'd have liked to have heard more details but they can wait and it now isn't all that important that you remember or I know all the details.

I think the reading I made on him on the 6th is accurate and what would interest me more at this point is your evaluation of the estimates and opinions I wrote you after that meeting.

In this it will be my purpose, if the day permits, to outline what I recommend (but do not insist on) as the immediate and long-range strategy and more of my thinking.

I have several strong impressions. First, I really wonder is they have malpractise insurance at all from their behavior. If they do, I think that unless they have some kind of special relationship with the insurer, they are making trouble for themselves. I think I detect some hangups and if I am correct, these will be available for us to use.

They are we sahre a problems their wealth and power. But all the signs I have seen, and I think I've seen enough of them in Webseter and his manner and arrogance, indicate a natural David-Goliath situation. They do not see it this way, as Goliath didn't. That I did before this is evidenced by my seeking out a David when I knew that the facts and the law are so clear I could have attracted a big-name lawyer. I think your youth and inexperience and my preference for you is one of their misreadings. Not only on the two of us but of more, perhaps even a belief that others had turned me down. They have no way of knowing that I spoke to bobody else about this, only to you. I never mentioned it to Harvey, for example, and his is a prestigeous firm.

Here I digress to tell you something I never had occasion to or in fact even occasion to recall. And from this I digress further to assure you of the reality of what John Dean has just reported, how much more can come back to mind under conditions conducive to recollection. I am absolutely without doubt that if and when we prepare for trial an enormous amount of further valuable fact will come back. Our problems here will not be with what I do and will recall and my abiliity to authenticate it but with what I will not. I will not be able to recall everything. But it will be much more than enough.

There came a time when Harvey started to prepare for trial. That firm has court-room specialists, good trial lawyers. One of them, some of a senior partner, is the one Harvey asked to do the courtroom work. That man simply ached to try this case, it was one of such incredible abuses, all authenticated. He had gone over the evidence. Some of this will washm off to dirty Williams and it makes his malpractise greater and more dramatic.

I am not suggesting that the Williams firm is crazy and is not aware of the potential of our going to court. Awareness of the opposite is what will control what I will and will not consider doing, as will the situation at any given time control what I will do. Here some of what I have seen Williams do is fine example. (I was there, for example, when he gave Arthur Krock a bugging device they had taken from a client's phone and as I recall traced to the FBI. Krock was fascinated by it, in my presence.)

Nor am I suggesting that I want to be vindictive or will let myself me. That can be destructive. My one interest if and when there is certainty that we will have to go to trial will be in winning and winning the maximum possible. It even then will not be in hurting them. However, at that time hurting them will not in any way inhibit what I will do or will want to if it is necessary to the central purpose. They may or may not fully understand what there is that can hurt them or the extent of this hurt. I think they know enough. I also think they do not know all. More, I think that if by some fluke they should win in court the damage to them can easily be greater than any sum could be.

Interruption. I'll continue later. Best,